

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined by the Office, and all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1 and 17-18 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The amendments to the claims find support at least at page 7, lines 29-37 of the specification.

In response to the final Office Action of October 2, 2006, applicant submitted a response within two months of the final Office Action on November 30, 2006. An Advisory Action was not mailed until after the end of the three-month shorted statutory period on January 10, 2007. Therefore, extension of time fees are calculated from the mailing date of the Advisory Action. Accordingly, applicant submits this response with a one-month extension of time fee.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The independent claims are claims 1 and 17.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Osano (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,591) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,217). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, whether alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest a first contact connected to ground and to an antenna input of a radio receiver, wherein a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and radio receiver, and wherein the connection via the band-pass filter component is configured to allow a radio signal to propagate from the first contact to the antenna input of the radio receiver, as recited in amended claim 1.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Osano fails to disclose that the band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and an antenna input of the radio receiver, and relies on Suzuki for this teaching. Claim 1 is amended to further distinguish the patentable subject matter of claim 1 from the cited references. The amendments to claim 1 clarify that the connection of the band-pass filter, the first contact, and

the radio receiver allow a radio signal to propagate from the first contact to the antenna input of the radio receiver. Despite the Office's reliance on Suzuki, Suzuki also fails to disclose suggest a band-pass filter interconnected between a first contact and an antenna input of a radio receiver, and that this connection allows a radio signal to propagate from the first contact to the antenna input. Figure 2 of Suzuki shows an electronic signal that was converted from speech voice being supplied to a band-pass filter 33 via a microphone jack 32. The electronic signal is then shown traveling through, among other devices, amplifiers 34 and 38 before being transmitted over the antenna 40 by way of the diplexer 39. See Suzuki column 3, lines 33-35. It is apparent that the antenna 40 is acting as an output when it eventually receives the electronic signal from the built-in microphone 31. Furthermore, the electronic signal from the microphone is not a radio signal as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Suzuki does not disclose or suggest a first contact connected to ground and to antenna input of a radio receiver, wherein a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and the radio receiver, and a radio signal can propagate from the first contact to the antenna input, as recited in amended claim 1. In contrast, Suzuki only discloses that when the antenna 40 acts to receive signals, the received signals are transmitted through a low-pass filter, and therefore does not disclose that the band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and the antenna input of the radio receiver, and that this connection allows a radio signal to be transferred from the first contact to the antenna input. Therefore, for at least this reason claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In addition, the Office fails to show that either Osano or Suzuki, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that the first contact is connected to ground and to the antenna input of the radio receiver, as recited in claim 1 because there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the cited references. There is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Osano with Suzuki, because Suzuki does not disclose anything more than what is already disclosed in Osano, other than including the band-pass filter 33 between the amplifier 34 and microphone jack 32. The Office asserts that item 56 in Figures 8A and 8B of Osano corresponds to the first contact recited in claim 1. There is an identical element present in the microphone jack 32 of Suzuki in Figure 2. Therefore, Suzuki does not provide any additional teachings than those disclosed in Osano, and there cannot be any motivation or suggestion to connect the first contact to ground and to the antenna input of a radio receiver

with a band-pass filter component interconnected between the first contact and antenna input, as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has engaged in impermissible hindsight reasons by merely piecing together elements from the prior art based on applicant's own disclosure. This is insufficient to establish that the cited references disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. See MPEP § 2143. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Independent claim 17 contains limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, is amended in a similar manner to claim 1, and is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, independent claim 17 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claims 2-7, 14 and 18 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are believed to be patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 8-13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Osano in view of Suzuki in further view of Ito (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,344). Claims 8-13 and 15-16 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are believed to be patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The

undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 February 2007

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Customer No. 004955